



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,952	03/12/2001	Atsushi Hayashi	108613	1943

7590

01/29/2003

Oliff & Berridge
PO Box 19928
Alexandria, VA 22320

EXAMINER

CAO, HUEDUNG X

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2671

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/762,952

Applicant(s)

HAYASHI, ATSUSHI

Examiner

Huedung X Cao

Art Unit

2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-9,11-13,18-21,23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5,10,14-17 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6-9, 11-13, 18-21, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mochizuki et al. (US 6,501,477) in view of Konoe et al. (US 6,319,119).

As per claim 1, Mochizuli teaches the claimed "image generation system" comprising:

"means for generating a motion of an object formed by a plurality of parts" (Mochizuki, column 1, line 27 to column 2, line 10); and

"means for generating an image including an image of the object on which the motion is generated" (Mochizuki, column 1, lines 9-26).

It is noted that Mochizuki does not teach "a physical simulation based on hit information" in which when the Nth part is hit and sequentially transmitting the hit information to the (N + 1)th, (N + 2)th, So that these parts are sequentially moved through a physical simulation based on the transmitted hit information as claimed. However, Mochizuki's effect of a part of the body to the neighbor parts in the object's

Art Unit: 2671

motion (Mochizuki, column 1, lines 50-58) suggests that when a part of the body is in motion, the remaining parts will be sequentially effect. Konoe teaches that when a part of the object is hit, the body of the object is effect by the hit information (Konoe, column 4, lines 51-67 and figure 17). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of Konoe, to configure Mochizuki's system as claimed because the effect of the hit information in a part of the body can sequentially resulted in the remaining parts of the body as showed by Mochizuki's motion of a human which includes a plurality of body parts.

Claim 6 adds into claim 1 "wherein processing is switched from a play of the object's motion based on the motion data to a generation of the object's motion through the physical simulation when the object is hit" (Konoe, column 4, lines 61-67).

Claim 7 adds into claim 1 "wherein processing is switched from a play of the object's motion based on the motion data to a generation of the object's motion through the physical simulation when a given condition is satisfied" (Konoe, col. 4, lines 61-67).

Due to the similarity of claim 8 to claim 6, it is rejected under a same reason.

Claim 11 adds into claim 8 "wherein the object is caused to perform a connecting motion which connects a motion generated by the physical simulation with a motion played based on the motion data" which Mochizuki teaches in column 29, lines 8-14.

Due to the similarity of claim 9 to claim 7, it is rejected under a same reason.

Claim 12 adds into claim 9 "wherein the object is caused to perform a connecting motion which connects a motion generated by the physical simulation with a motion played based on the motion data" which Mochizuki teaches in column 29, lines 8-14.

Claims 13, 18-21, and 23-24 claim a computer usable program based on the system of claims 1, 6-9, and 11-12, respectively, they are rejected under a same reason.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-5, 10, 14-17, and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Carter (US 4695058) teaches an shooting game for play by a plurality of players wherein players shoot at each other while avoiding being shot at is provided.

Ikematsu (US 5613913) teaches a method for developing attractions in a shooting game system with which players can experience gun fights between the targets and players.

Yamamoto (US 6335731 B1) teaches an image generation device for generating an image at a given viewpoint within an object space.

Art Unit: 2671

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Huedung Cao** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-5024**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Mark Zimmerman**, can be reached at **(703) 305-9798**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 305-0377.

Huedung Cao
Patent Examiner


MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600